

REMARKS

In light of the above amendments and remarks to follow, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 15, and amended claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 20, and 21 are in this application. Claims 4-7, 10-13, 16-19, and 22 are canceled without prejudice.

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because reference characters 111 and 11 have both been used to designate a protruding portion, and reference characters 61 and 41 have both been used to designate an antenna cover.

With regard to reference numbers 111 and 11, reference number 111 refers to a protruding portion on a hinge for a second opening/closing mechanism while reference number 11 refers to a keyboard. With regard to reference numbers 41 and 61, although both numbers refer to an antenna cover, each reference number refers to a separate antenna cover (see Figure 25(c)).

In addition, the Examiner stated that figures 15-18 and 20-23 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- or --Conventional Art--. Figures 15-18 and 20-23 have been amended to include the label --Prior Art--. Replacement sheets with the amended drawings are being submitted herewith.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the above objections to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Masaki et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,285,328).

Independent claim 1, as amended herein recites in part as follows:

“...wherein said antenna member is located in an off center position of a side portion of said display unit.”

It is respectfully submitted that Masaki as applied by the Examiner (hereinafter “Masaki”) does not disclose the above-recited feature. That is, Masaki states that the “flat antenna 11 is disposed at the center of the distal part of the display unit...” (See col. 5, lines 21-22.) As such, Masaki does not appear to disclose an antenna in an off center position of a side portion of said display unit. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be distinguishable from Masaki.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to claim 1, amended independent claims 2 and 14 are believed to be distinguishable from Masaki.

Claims 3 and 15 depend from one of claims 1 and 14, and, due to such dependency, are believed to be distinguishable from Masaki for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 have been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

This is in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter, which accompanied the Office Action mailed October 31, 2003. To the extent the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter states, implies or is construed to mean that the claims are allowable over the prior art of record because the Examiner believes the claims should be interpreted to include one or more features

or limitations not recited therein, Applicants' attorney disagrees with such an interpretation.

Moreover, it is Applicants' contention that there is no particular limitation in the allowed claims that is more critical than any other. The issuance of the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter should not be construed as a surrender by Applicants of any subject matter. It is the intent of Applicants, by their attorney, to construe the allowed claims so as to cover the invention disclosed in the instant application and all equivalents to which the claimed invention is entitled.

In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Dennis M. Smid
Reg. No. 34,930
(212) 588-0800